

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Lamont Karriem,

Plaintiff

v.

Cellco Partnership Inc, et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:20-cv-00884-JAD-VCF

Ninth Circuit Case No. 23-15164

**Order Revoking
in forma pauperis Status**

The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit referred this matter back to this court for the limited purpose of determining whether plaintiff Lamont Karriem’s *in forma pauperis* status should continue for this appeal.¹ The decision to continue such status turns on whether the entirety of Karriem’s appeal is frivolous, for “[i]f at least one issue or claim is found to be non-frivolous, leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal must be granted for the case as a whole.”²

Karriem initiated this suit by filing three separate complaints, each alleging largely the same facts but with different claims and against different defendants.³ Each complaint was dismissed with leave to amend for failure to state a claim. Those cases were then consolidated into this action, in which Karriem sued various state-court judges; police sheriffs and officers; the city of Las Vegas, Nevada; and various non-state actors for violations of his constitutional rights following his arrest. The court gave Karriem two more chances to amend his complaint

¹ ECF No. 37.

² *Hooker v. Am. Airlines*, 302 F.3d 1091, 1092 (9th Cir. 2002).

³ See ECF No. 1; *Karriem v. Extended Stay America Inc.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-00942-JAD-VCF; *Karriem v. County of Clark, Nev.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-01915-JAD VCF.

1 for failure to state a claim against any of those defendants.⁴ In each amendment, Karriem did not
 2 follow court orders and attempted to bring claims that the court advised him were unavailable to
 3 him.⁵ I eventually dismissed Karriem's third-amended complaint with prejudice, finding that (1)
 4 the judge defendants were entitled to judicial immunity; (2) the non-state-actor defendants
 5 couldn't be sued under § 1983; (3) Karriem could not maintain his supervisory-liability claims
 6 against the sheriff defendants; (4) the complaint did not adequately state a *Monell* claim against
 7 the City; and (5) any remaining claims concerning his arrest were insufficiently pled and barred
 8 by the Supreme Court's ruling in *Heck v. Humphrey*.⁶ And, as the magistrate judge noted in one
 9 of his screening orders, Karriem has repeatedly brought cases relying on the same facts against
 10 different defendants in various other courts, and all of those complaints have been dismissed.⁷

11 **Because the appeal from the dismissal order is frivolous and not taken in good faith, IT IS**
 12 **HEREBY ORDERED THAT the district court revokes *in forma pauperis* status so *in forma***
 13 ***pauperis* status will not continue on appeal.**

14 The Clerk of Court is directed to **SEND a copy of this order to the Clerk of the United**
 15 **States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for Case No. 23-15164.**

16
 17
 18 
 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
 February 7, 2023

21 ⁴ See ECF No. 4; ECF No. 17.

22 ⁵ Compare ECF No. 4 and ECF No. 17 (screening orders) with ECF No. 11 and ECF No. 20
 (Karriem's amended complaints).

23 ⁶ *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). See generally ECF No. 31.

⁷ See ECF No. 17 at 1 n.1.